This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

923
Wine

Temp
10
923
Wine

Bd. Oct. 1904

LIBRARY

OF THE

DIVINITY SCHOOL

Social—
//0 Temp

THE

WINE-QUESTION.

A Review.

Reprinted from "Words for the New Church," No. X.

DIVINITY SCHOOL LIBRARY HARVARD UNIVERSITY

THE WINE-QUESTION.

A Review.

REPRINTED FROM "WORDS FOR THE NEW CHURCH," NO. X.

PUBLISHED FOR THE ACADEMY OF THE NEW CHURCH.
PHILADELPHIA.
1882.

PREFACE.

IT has been thought that a wider dissemination of this review, which is at the same time a thorough and searching investigation of the Wine Question in the light of the New Church, of reason and of science could not fail to be of use to the New Church at the present time. The action of an Association of the Church in this country in substituting for the wine in the Holy Supper "the must of unfermented wine," and the action of the Conference in Great Britain in voting down a motion to ascertain from the Word and the Writings what kind of wine and bread should be used at the Holy Communion, show that the New Church is at present passing through a severe infestation on this subject, and that it is the duty of those acquainted with the Divine Truth as presented in the Word and in the Writings of the Church, to stem the flood of these fallacies and falsities, and boldly to declare the truth.

This task is rendered an unpleasant one, because the whole movement is accompanied with imputations and insinuations as to the personal character of those who do not yield to it, and with complacent claims of superior righteousness and sanctity for those who join in the movement; claims well calculated to infatuate and seduce the self-love of the unregenerate and to bribe the judgment of the unwary.

It is only as the clouds of these fallacies and falsities are dissipated, that the sunshine of the Divine Truth is restored to us; it is only thus that we can, untrammeled by the scruples of a false and perverted conscience, enjoy the "wine that maketh glad the heart of man" and "which excites the things which are of charity;" and again it is only as these falses are dispersed that the consociation of Heaven and the Church in the Holy Communion and their conjunction with the LORD can rest secure from the desecration and profanation which ensues when elements selected by the self-intelligence of man are substituted for those ordained by God.

We hope that the truths herein set forth may contribute to preserve and to spread the rational and heavenly use of wine in the Church of the Lord, that the hearts of its members may give thanks to the Lord with gladness, and that friendship and mutual love may be thereby excited among its members to an ever more heavenly activity.

Editors of "The Words for the New Church."

NOTES AND REVIEWS.

The Wine Question.

THE WINE QUESTION, in the light of the New Dispensation. By JOHN ELLIS, M.D. Published by the Author. New York, 1882.

THIS book contains, in two hundred and twenty-eight pages, the author's defense of his position of total abstinence. It is divided into fourteen chapters, treating respectively of alcohol as a poison, fermented and unfermented wines, their history and Biblical use, communion wine, and counter-reviews of articles in New Church periodicals.

It would seem at first sight that so external a question as What shall we eat or drink? however important it may be on its own natural and sensual plane, should not be discussed in a publication devoted chiefly to the consideration of spiritual subjects. But there is one aspect of the question which is important and vital to the Church; and this is the use of wine as the representative and correspondent of the Divine Truth in the Holy Supper. For this reason it is deemed useful to consider the subject in its varied aspects and at some length.

The plan pursued in the book readily admits of a consideration of the question under four heads: the linguistic, the scientific, the historic, and the theological.

The consideration of certain terms occupies a large portion of the book. These are: wine (Hebrew, יַיִן, *yayin;* Greek, *οἶνος*, *oinos;* Latin, *vinum*); must (Hebrew, תִּירוֹשׁ, *tīrosh;* Greek, *γλεῦκος*, *gleukos;* Latin, *mustum*); strong drink (Hebrew, שֵׁכָר, *shechar;* Latin, *sicera*); and finally honey (Hebrew, דְּבַשׁ)*. As the author writes as one having knowledge and authority, we naturally ask what qualifications he brings to the inquiry.

From a careful perusal of the work we are convinced that the author either has no adequate knowledge of the sacred tongues, or he has grossly perverted them. Common charity forbids the latter conclusion. But how far it is compatible with true charity to claim to teach authoritatively that which we do not understand, and concerning which we do not even use the

* debash'

means of instruction always at hand, namely, dictionaries, and works of unbiased learned men, we leave to the decision of the reader.

Further, we are met with the query, Does the author sufficiently understand his own mother tongue, or does he use words with a meaning foreign to their recognized sense? This question is forced on us by statements like the following: "We know there are wines and strong drinks which are never unholy or unclean,—wines every way suitable for use in the most holy ordinance of the LORD'S Supper,—wines that never 'maketh drunken'." (p. 44.) "It is not *wines*, but *intoxicating* wines that earnest Christian leaders seek to have exchanged for the ancient unintoxicating wines." (p. 197.) *Wine*, according to Worcester and Webster, signifies "the fermented juice of grapes." How, then, can wine, fermented juice, be called "wine that never maketh drunken," and how can it be claimed that some "fermented grape-juice" is intoxicating wine, while other wine (fermented grape-juice) is unintoxicating? It is evident that the author uses the word wine in an unauthorized sense. We are indeed well aware that he wishes to make it appear as if Worcester and Webster define wine as *unfermented* grape-juice. But he does not, as would be naturally expected, turn to the definition of *wine*, but evasively inquires into the definition of *must*. Worcester is careful to call *must* "the juice of the grape," and does *not* call it simply wine, but *new wine*. Webster, less careful, defines it as "wine pressed from the grape not fermented," thus contradicting his own definition of the word *wine*. Yet the author, in his blind zeal, exclaims: "So that both authorities say that the unfermented juice of the grape is wine." (p. 167.) The straightforward course which would be chosen by any one desirous of finding out the real truth, would be to go to Worcester's and Webster's definition of *wine*. Here he would at once see that both these authorities are very clear, and agree perfectly; for Worcester defines *wine* as: "The fermented juice of the grape, a spirituous liquor," and also "the fermented juice of certain fruits," thus not allowing any application to unfermented beverages at all; and Webster defines it as: "1. The fermented juice of grapes; a beverage prepared from grapes by squeezing out their juice, and allowing it to ferment. 2. Hence a liquor or beverage resembling that prepared from grapes yielded by other kinds of fruit. 3. The effect of drinking wine in excess, intoxication." Thus we see that the author in claiming for himself these authorities has allowed his zeal to outstrip his discretion. We dwell so long on this point because it illustrates the general mode of demonstration of the writers on abstinence, and of our author in particular. There is everywhere apparent an attempt to confuse common perception by some misleading twist or turn.

Since scholars are aware that the recognized meaning of the English word

wine is the *fermented* juice of the grape, or of other fruits, it is evident that when the Latin dictionaries translate *vinum* with *wine* they thereby declare that *vinum* in Latin signifies the *fermented* juice of the grape, and so, when Swedenborg uses the word *vinum* unqualified, he means fermented grape-juice.

The author indeed endeavors to show that Swedenborg recognizes two kinds of wine, both called *vinum*, the one fermented and the other unfermented; but the only passage which he brings to support this strange assertion is mistranslated, and thus rendered is quoted eighteen times in the course of the book. It is found first on the title-page, and reads: "Such wines and strong drink as (?) cause drunkenness." This would seem to imply that there are also wines and strong drink which do not cause drunkenness. Any scholar would at once know that since *wine* is fermented grape-juice, and *strong drink* is in the original "intoxicating drink," the passage, as the author quotes it, would mean: "Such fermented grape-juice and intoxicating drink as cause intoxication." And as this would be evidently absurd, the scholar would at once go to the Latin to rectify the mistranslation. If the author had pursued this course he would have seen that the passage simply reads in the original: "Wine and strong drink which cause intoxication," thus leaving no support whatever to his fancies.

When we consult the Greek, we find that the term used for wine in the New Testament is οἶνος (*oinos*). The meanings of this word, as given in our largest Greek Lexicon, that of Liddel and Scott, are the following: "1. The fermented juice of the grape; 2. The fermented juice of apples, pears, etc., cider, perry; 3. A fermented liquor made from barley or wheat, a kind of beer." And this very complete dictionary of the Greek tongue knows of no unfermented liquor under the name of οἶνος. There is no doubt therefore that the beverage into which the water was changed at Cana, being οἶνος, was also "fermented grape-juice." The ingenious way in which the author tries to circumvent these well-established definitions acknowledged by all scholars and learned men, is as remarkable as his misapplication of Worcester and Webster.

The Hebrew word יַיִן, *yayin* (wine), according to the great authorities, Fürst and Gesenius, signifies *wine*, which, as we have seen, is understood by the learned to mean "fermented grape-juice." Gesenius distinctly declares it to be equivalent to οἶνος and to *vinum*.

Must, Latin *mustum*, is translated *fresh*, *new* or *unfermented wine*. But as the fresh or new wine speedily begins to ferment, *must* also signifies partially fermented grape-juice. This much is granted by the author (p. 48).

When we pass to the Greek this is still more manifest. The term which

the author quotes as signifying the sweet, unfermented juice of the grape is γλεῦκος (*gleukos*), which in Liddel and Scott's Greek Lexicon is regarded as equal to the Latin *mustum*, must, and is translated *sweet new wine.* Still even this *must*, in the only passage in which it is found in the New Testament, signifies fermented and intoxicating wine: "Others mocking said, These men are full of *must* (γλεῦκος, *gleukos*). But Peter . . . said . . . These are not drunken (μεθύουσον), seeing it is but the third hour of the day." (Acts ii. 13–15.) Indeed, it is well known that more drunkenness occurs in the wine-producing countries about the time of new wine than at any other, and this from drinking the partially fermented *must* while it still retains some of its sweetness. While we see that the γλεῦκος in the New Testament is fermented and intoxicating, still more is this the case with the *new wine*, which is compared to the truths of the New Testament and the New Church (*A. R.* 316). This is conclusively proved by two considerations: *First*, Swedenborg, in translating it does not use the ambiguous term *mustum*, but the term *vinum*, which, as we have seen, is "the fermented juice of the grape;" and, *Second*, This term is the translation of the Greek οἶνος νέος, and οἶνος, as we have seen, signifies fermented grape-juice. The author of the work before us indeed devotes several pages to show that a fermented wine would not in any case burst the (skins) bottles. But he merely proves his unacquaintance with the subject. Those who are acquainted with wine-making know that the primary fermentation is followed by secondary fermentations, occurring periodically for several years, until full purity is reached. On account of this secondary fermentation it is that new wine (οἶνος νέος) needs new bottles.

In the Hebrew, too, the term translated *must* or new wine generally means fermented wine. Gesenius, who is one of the chief authorities in Hebrew, says in his great dictionary: "תִּירוֹשׁ* *new wine*, so called because it gets possession of the brain and inebriates." In sustaining this derivation he quotes *Hosea* iv. 11: "Whoredom and wine and new wine take away the heart," *i.e.*, the understanding. Fürst defines it as *mead*, which seems a less felicitous rendering, and he gives to it the meaning of *what is gotten* from grapes and other fruits. As Swedenborg uses the Latin term *mustum* to translate *tĭrosh*, and as *tĭrosh* is recognized as intoxicating in the Hebrew, the same force must evidently apply to the term *mustum* when used by Swedenborg. The English translator of the Hebrew Lexicon of Gesenius has the following remarks on תִּירוֹשׁ, *tĭrosh:* "All the passages [in the Word] go to show that תִּירוֹשׁ is *new wine* of the first year, the *wine-crop* or *vintage* of the season; and hence it is mostly coupled with wine and oil as a *product* of the land. That it was intoxicating is shown by *Hosea* iv. 11." Thus we see that not only is wine always used for the fer-

* tĭrosh'

mented juice of the grape, but also *new wine* is wine which is passing, or has passed, through its first and chief fermentation, and is therefore usually intoxicating. Smith, in his *Dictionary of the Bible*, indeed considers the *tirosh* or new wine in *Hosea* iv. 11, as "the climax of engrossing influences." So we see that the author is altogether in error when he teaches that יַיִן*, *οἶνος* and *vinum*, as also תִּירוֹשׁ†, *γλεῦκος* and *mustum*, in the Word and the Writings, when used in a good sense, signify unfermented wine.

But the perversion of the author becomes more glaring when we examine his definition of *strong drink* (Hebrew, שֵׁכָר, *shechar;* Greek, *σίκερα*, *sikera;* Latin, *sicera*). This word is derived from the verb שָׁכַר *shachar, to be drunk*, and all scholars agree that it signifies *intoxicating drink.* (See Fürst and Gesenius.) As a convenient general term it was also introduced into the Greek as *σίκερα*, which is defined in Liddel and Scott's Dictionary as "*a fermented liquor, strong drink* (Hebrew *shakar*, to be intoxicated)." It was also introduced into Latin as *sicera*, and this is defined in White and Riddle's Latin Dictionary as "A kind of spirituous, intoxicating drink." A word, the derivation, as well as the usage and signification of which is so clear, might have been expected to be safe from perversion. But the author describes it as "a luscious drink or sweet syrup, especially of sugar or honey, of dates or of the palm-tree" (p. 56), and he forthwith devotes two and a half pages to a consideration of this new (intoxicating) syrup. He says: "The very fact that strong drink in the Word sometimes has a good signification . . . is evidence that in an unpolluted and unperverted state it [the intoxicating drink] could neither have been fermented nor have been a drugged drink." (p. 57.) A mind that can content itself with such a miserable begging of the question is evidently outside of the reach of any logical reasoning. The entire scriptural and philological reasoning of the author might be summed up in the assertion: Fermented drinks are evil, therefore wine (fermented grape-juice) and strong drink (intoxicating drink) when mentioned in a good sense in the Word, must have been unfermented. All the pseudo-learning of the abstinence writers quoted by the author amounts to no more than this, when tested by standard dictionaries and learned commentaries.

We come now to the word דְּבַשׁ (*debash*), honey. Concerning this the author declares: "In only three cases out of nearly fifty does the word refer to the product prepared by bees rather than by man." (p. 63.) The fact, as shown by the dictionaries, is just the opposite. There are only two passages referred by Fürst and Gesenius to the syrup formed from grapes, while all other passages refer to honey. But even these two show nothing in their context which would lead us to think of them as signifying syrup, rather than honey. They are the following: "Carry down to

* yayin † tïrosh'

the man (Joseph) a present, a little balm, and a little honey, spices and myrrh, nuts and almonds" (*Gen.* xliii. 11), and, "Judah and the land of Israel, they were thy merchants: they traded in thy market, wheat of Minnith and Pannag, and honey and oil and balm." (*Ez.* xxvii. 17.) There is nothing in these passages which would make it probable that something else is meant there by *debash* than what is acknowledged to be the meaning of the word in the other fifty-two passages; namely, *honey*. The only reason, so far as we know, why it has been supposed that these passages refer to *syrup* instead of to honey, is because the Mahommedans, who are forbidden to use their grapes for making wine, boil the grape-juice into syrup and export it largely in this form. But it has not been shown that this custom prevailed in ancient times; *i.e.*, so far back as 1700 and 600 years before Christ, especially when grapes were then so abundant in Egypt that even slaves like the sons of Israel could enjoy them. (*Numbers* xx. 5.) Nor is there, on the other hand, any reason why honey, so plentiful then in Canaan, should not have been largely exported to those countries in which honey was less rich and less plentiful. But in the New Church we are not left in doubt, for the passages mentioned are translated eight times and always with the Latin word *mel*, which signifies not, syrup, but honey; and no distinction is made in the internal sense of honey as developed in these passages from what it means in other passages.

We see therefore that in its linguistic aspect, the work under review is altogether in contradiction to what the learned world knows on this subject And the author's opinions being altogether opposed to the facts of the case are false.

When we turn to science we might expect something better, as the author's profession would seem to necessitate a certain amount of scientific culture. But what knowledge of science the writer may have, has been made subservient to a false principle and therefore falsified, as will be seen in what follows. In reply to a former article in the SERIAL our author says:

"That alcohol, like other poisons, may sometimes be used advantageously, as a remedy, we do not question. Its action is to paralyze the capillary vessels and thereby fill them with blood, and in cases of hemorrhage, by thus temporarily storing up the blood in these minute vessels and preventing the heart from forcing it out of the body through the ruptured vessels, and by thus congesting the minute vessels of the brain, it prevents fatal syncope or fainting, and when thus used as a medicine it is useful."

One unacquainted with physiology might think this a true explanation of the *modus operandi* of brandy. But a very superficial reading will demonstrate its utter falsity.

In the first place, though, we wish to state that we did not allude to hemorrhage, and we do not see how we could have been so misunderstood. Our words were, that diluted brandy "may save life when the parturient woman is exhausted and the uterus fails in its expulsive efforts." We referred to the power of brandy in effecting contractions of the uterine fibres with consequent increase of labor-pains.

But granting the writer's interpretation of our meaning, we nevertheless decidedly differ with him in his attempted physiological explanation of the action of alcohol.

Picture to the mind a woman seized with dangerous hemorrhage. In a few moments her body becomes cold, and she is almost pulseless. The breathing is superficial, and the pale face wears the anxious look of approaching death. Brandy is administered, and soon the bleeding ceases, the radial pulse is felt to increase in volume while it lessens in rapidity; the breathing is more deeply drawn, and warmth replaces the clammy coldness of the skin. Did the remedy employed work these changes by paralyzing the capillaries? The author of the work before us says yes; but Ringer, Wood, Bartholow, Pavy, Bache, Stillé, and a host of others, whom even Dr. Ellis would hardly regard as "comparatively obscure writers," say no.

The author, probably following Richardson, mistakes the dilatation of the arterioles caused by alcohol for paralysis. Such dilatation of necessity augments the amount of blood in the small vessels, but not to be retained there in storage, as would be the case in paralysis. On the contrary, to keep them full, the heart must send more at a time in each pulse, and so must receive more from the venous system; hence the circulation is quickened, not retarded. And the increased volume of blood in the various organs stimulates them to more vigorous activity. Thus the uterus is induced to contract, and to close its gaping vessels, through which the life's blood was pouring out. The action of the heart is also quickened by a direct effect of the brandy on its structure, making it do more than average work in a given time.

The author, in one place, considers our physiology stupid and simple. Viewed in the light of such physiology as he treats us to above, we feel like pardoning the offense; it was evidently unavoidable.

It requires enormous doses to produce an immediate decided reduction of pulse-rate. Zimmerberg used an amount of alcohol equivalent to three or four pints of brandy before he succeeded in lessening the arterial pressure. "In moderate doses," says Wood, "alcohol appears to be a powerful stimulant of the heart and circulation, but in poisonous doses it very probably does diminish both the force and frequency of the pulse."

To assert, then, that brandy makes the blood slink away into the capillaries, is to say what experimentation and daily observation flatly contradict.

And, besides, how can brandy induce uterine contractions,—and that it does is a matter of demonstration,—if it acts paralyzingly?

In reply to the SERIAL'S position that alcohol is a food, the author retorts that the increase in weight, which follows its use, is due to its property of retarding the waste of tissue.

But facts are again in opposition to mere theory. "At present the weight of authority and the deductions of experiment are in favor of the view that alcohol yields up force which is applied as nervous, muscular, and gland force. The amount of alcohol ingested in excess of this oxidizing power of the organism is eliminated by the various excretory channels. It is a useful food in the small quantity which increases but does not impair digestion, which quickens circulation and gland secretion but does not overstimulate, and which is within the limit of the power of the organism to dispose of by the oxidation processes." (*Bartholow.*)

Flint, who can scarcely be numbered with the advocates of alcohol, nevertheless admits that it is absolutely certain that most of the alcohol, which is taken in quantities not sufficient to intoxicate, is consumed in the organism.

Of the same nature is the objection to the SERIAL'S allusion to the experiments of Dr. Ford and of Dupré. The alcohol, which they found in the tissues of the most abstemious, was derived from hepatic sugar. The author claims that this conversion of the sugar is excretory, and so is as foreign to the organism as is the used-up carbon, the retention of which is dangerous to life.

Dr. Ford, however, who, by the way, is not "an obscure journal writer," but a professor in an accredited college, offers an entirely different solution of the subject. He says: "According to the hypothesis under which the preceding experimentation was conducted, alcohol should coexist with sugar in the circulation. . . . The *destination* of alcohol, whose presence in the economy I have thus demonstrated, must be to a *hæmal oxidation* or 'combustion,' as a *main source of animal heat.*" The italics are in the original.

Another palpable physiological error in the pamphlet is contained in the following: "Good, pure, clean water, the unfermented blood of the grape, good sound wheat and other grains, sweet unleavened bread, good fresh mutton and beef from healthy cattle, supply the wants of the human body and give substance and thus strength, without causing any unnatural excitement or depression, or any disease peculiar to the article used, however freely it may be taken, and without causing any unnatural appetite which other healthy articles will not satisfy, and without requiring to be taken in gradually increasing quantities to satisfy the appetite for them, and which

therefore in their action are not seductive, are all good uses, according to the philosophy of Swedenborg, and always have a good signification and correspondence, and they are never evil or bad uses, and they never have a bad signification or correspondence." (page 13.)

If the reader is not out of breath and perplexed with this long and involved sentence, which, by the way, we took the liberty of abbreviating somewhat, we desire to tax his patience with a line or two more. On another page the author says: "The sweet, which corresponds to spiritual delights, causes no disease which any other healthy article taken in excess might not cause."

It is not the only object of food to supply substance for the body. Functions need their normal stimulus, and this they receive in many ways; as by spices, wine, pure air, etc. Temperately employed stimulants do not create undue excitement and subsequent depression; neither do they develop an ever-increasing appetite for them, demanding larger and larger quantities to satisfy craving. In proper amount they simply arouse and invigorate the functions in a manner which insipid articles of food cannot do. And as this is effected within the normal range of activity, no subsequent depression can possibly exist, any more than debility can follow the inhalation of a pure, odor-laden atmosphere.

"The sight of green trees, the sound of the sea, the smell of flowers, may give energy and appetite to the invalid in such a way as to be perceptible. The healthy man may be less conscious of such emotion, but it may strongly influence him. Now alcohol in some liquors, which contain but a small quantity, does check, in many cases, the current of cares for a time, and the slight degree of pleasure thus excited serves to set the digestive process in action. This is not only a lawful use of alcohol, it is one which is in many cases very beneficial, and to neglect it would be wrong. . . . To speak of the danger of producing such slight excitement of the heart's action is an abuse of science; if it were true, every exertion, every pleasing emotion, nay, all activity of every sort, would tend to shorten our days, and they alone would be wise and happy who existed in torpor." These are the words of the conservative writer, Dr. W. S. Greenfield.

To say that intemperance in sweets does not lead to peculiar diseased states, is an error. Sugar in excess causes dropsy, swollen liver, emaciation, pallor, and even chlorosis. Sugar, says Hering, spoils the temper and unfits our women for the duties of life. It dulls the mind, while it renders the temper irritable and peevish. This is unique, and is by no means the same as "any other healthy article taken in excess" will cause.

Phillips writes approvingly of the grape-cure; but, referring to its excessive use, he says: "With less constancy but still with much frequency,

grapes act in a laxative or even a decidedly purgative manner; and if this is carried to excess there may be excoriation of the tongue, chronic diarrhœa, and an aphthous condition of the whole alimentary canal."

It is to the deleterious effects of the sugar, etc., in the must that Swedenborg refers in *True Christian Religion*, 404: "The must of wine unfermented has a pleasant taste, but infests the stomach."

Alluding to this passage, the author of the pamphlet remarks, that must fermenting is spoken of by Swedenborg as disagreeing with the stomach (p. 105). Such wine, he remarks on another page, is turbid and foul, and in this state is unwholesome to the stomach (p. 152).

But this is a gross perversion of the clear meaning of Swedenborg's words. The words are "must of wine *unfermented;*" and cannot mean, "wine while fermenting," as the author asserts (p. 105). For how can that be pleasant to the taste, which, according to the author's admission, is turbid and foul?

We presume Swedenborg had in mind the well-known fact that new, unfermented wines are laxative. Thus Dioscorides wrote: "Sweet wines disorder the bowels, as does *unfermented* wine." And Pliny remarked: "Sweet wines are less useful for digestion; old wine mixed with water is more nutritious; for while sweet wine is *less inebriating* it floats in the stomach."

And, too, Swedenborg declares that new wine is not readily digested; for he says, "the chyle sometimes contains crude vegetable emulsions, effluvia, juices, and vapid portions of new wine, or of unfermented or unclarified beer. Hence, the lymph is a kind of ultimate saliva, whose office it is to digest the chyle itself." (*Animal Kingdom*, Part I. p. 220.) He never says this of good, old, generous wines.

Referring to *D. P.* 284, the SERIAL stated that "in this beautiful extract evil with its falsities is compared with leaven and with the lees; and good is compared with generous wine."

To this the author replies: "by what authority does the Academy's organ say that, in the above extract" (meaning *D. P.* 284) "evil with its falsities is compared with leaven and lees? It will be seen that this representation is not correct; for it is the combat and separation and falling to the bottom which is compared, and not the leaven and lees. Lees have a good signification when this word is used in a good sense, as in Isaiah xxv. 6. (*A. E.* 1159, 252, *A. C.* 5943.) . . . But it is perfectly evident that the lees which fall to the bottom during the fermentation of wine can have no such signification, so that the Academy, after all, is not so far from the truth when it claims that *lees are compared by Swedenborg to falsities, and, consequently, according to their philosophy, correspond to falsities.*"

Well, our authority is Swedenborg, and we are pleased to see that our critic, after a brief and wholly irrelevant digression, returns to the subject with a similar conclusion. That the comparison in the passage referred to extends to the lees as well as to the falling of the lees, is further proved by a similar analogy in *C. L.* 272, where we read that "man in the world is invested with a material body and this is filled with cupidities, and these are there just like the lees, which precipitate themselves to the bottom when the must of wine is clarified." Here lees, and not merely the falling of lees, is compared with cupidities.

But the author maintains that whenever fermentation and regeneration are compared in the Writings, reference is made to a similarity in process, not in products. And he claims that Swedenborg denounced alcoholic preparations (whisky) as pernicious. Wine, when fermented, always has a bad correspondence, because ferments are evil.

Let us see, then, what were Swedenborg's views concerning alcoholic preparations.

Distillation, in his philosophy, is the separation of finer elements from the coarser, and their arrangement as the superficies of sphericles, the cavities of which are occupied by ether. This new formation, alcohol, is less compounded, more perfect and more universal than coarser bodies. It therefore belongs to ethereal forms, which are on the plane of the purer portions of the human body. It is the highest of three orders of chemical substances: salts, oils, and spirits; which latter are called oils most highly rectified.

Alcohol, therefore, belongs to the class of chemicals, which generate the mild heat produced interiorly in the blood, directly under the influence of the animal spirit.

It is well known that Swedenborg's philosophy was the same for the macrocosm that it was for the microcosm of man. And so we find him applying precisely the same principles in the human economy that he did in his studies of the world at large.

The blood receives *pabulum* from the various classes into which chemicals are divided. And substances which are employed for food are resolvable into these same classes in the processes of digestion and assimilation. So perfect is the comparison between the manufacture of alcohol and digestion, that Swedenborg explains the two phenomena as nearly identical. He says: "The heat first sends off phlegm (meaning water), as in the mouth and fauces, then the weaker, and afterwards the more rectified spirits, as in the stomach; next oils, gradually more and more dense, and at length fetid, as in the intestines; the residue being a *caput mortuum*, or *fæces*." (*Animal Kingdom*, Part I. p. 162.)

Here stomachic digestion is very appropriately compared to the manufacture of rectified spirits. When food comes under the influence of the gastric juice it is set in motion by the muscular fibres of the stomach, macerated and fermented by warmth, impregnated by purer and purer menstrua of digestion, until it is resolved into "spirits, tinctures, milky products, phlegm, and refuse." Is this not very much like distillation? The purest portions are carried to the brain, the next, into the blood, the next, into lymphatics; the residue goes into the intestines for further digestion. The purest portions are, like alcohol, most highly rectified.

Consulting the Writings, we find Swedenborg making use of his chemico-physiological knowledge to confirm corresponding spiritual truths.

Thus, there is a series of analogies between digestion, fermentation, and regeneration, extending to the highest and purest productions of the respective processes.

In some places the clarification of wine makes the comparison; in others, its homogeneity is referred to (*D. P.* 25). In still others, its nobility (see below). Again, elevation into a purer aura is mentioned, comparing the chemical altitude of alcohol to the raising of the mind by regeneration into a superior aura (*C. L.* 145). And, finally, spiritual wisdom is compared with alcohol, both because it is highly rectified spirits, and because of its ardor (*C. L.* 145).

But when this culmination is reached, and alcohol and wisdom stand forth as parallels, the author of the book under review would have us drop the figure and declare the comparison at an end. The one product he regards as essentially hellish, the other, of course, essentially heavenly.

His ground for this false assumption is that alcohol is a poison and that fermentation is evil, and its resultant evil also. And he quotes Swedenborg to sustain his position.

Alcohol may indeed become a poison when taken in concentrated form, as when separated from the wine or liquor and used in quantity. And this calls up another point in the book before us. The author continually declares against drinking alcohol, coupled with the assertion that it is a poison. We have indeed used the term alcohol in place of alcoholic beverages. But this is unavoidable in considering scientific statements as to doses, etc., for alcohol is the only proper basis of comparison. But we had no idea that our readers, especially one who lays claim to any scientific education, would fail to understand us.

Whether or not absolute alcohol is poisonous has nothing to do with the question before us. And the whole argument of the author, based thereon, is false and misleading. The question at issue is whether or not alcoholic *beverages* are injurious or poisonous. We assert, in contradiction to the

author, that such beverages are not poisonous; and, further, we claim that alcohol itself has a good correspondence. It becomes poisonous only when so concentrated as to become productive of injury by its very ardor. The sun's rays, concentrated, destroy life; are they therefore poisonous? An atmosphere of pure oxygen is by no means salubrious; is it therefore poisonous?

Even granting, for argument's sake, that pure alcohol in quantity poisons, it does not follow that the same alcohol properly swathed, like the sun's rays in the atmospheres, or the oxygen in association with a large volume of nitrogen, is poisonous. There are in nature a number of substances which are of great use, but which when concentrated act as poisons. Prussic acid is a direful poison, but a kindred salt, the *sulphocyanide of sodium* (or *potassium*), is in the saliva; it thus contributes to the usefulness of one of the menstrua of digestion. This same *sulphocyanide*, extracted in quantity, will destroy life. So, too, hydrochloric acid, which no one will class as less injurious than pure alcohol, exists as an essential ingredient of the gastric juice, and contributes to the maintenance of the human body.

Many other substances might be cited, as citric acid, oxalic acid, etc. It is equally true that these in concentrated form injure and kill, while in diluted form they perform good uses in the animal economy.

Drs. Anstie and Parkes agree in assigning one fluid ounce of absolute alcohol, drunk with water of course, and thus equal to from two to two and a half fluid ounces of spirits, as the limit of moderation for a dose, without resulting injury. "Up to this quantity," says Pavy, "its action is that of a stimulant," thus not of a poison.

But to resume. Swedenborg has been misquoted as an opponent of alcoholic beverages.

Referring to digestion, Swedenborg says: "The office of menstruum is not confined to the *salivæ*, but extends to all kinds of liquids taken by the mouth, as water, milk, syrups, juices, *beer*, *wine*, SPIRITS; which the stomach therefore desires, sometimes with a certain secret craving" (*Animal Kingdom*).

The use of "therefore" here is highly significative. The stomach desires these liquids because they are menstrua of digestion.

In several places in the Writings wine is designated generous, noble (*Coronis* 22, *C. L.* 475, *T. C. R.* 215, *D. P.* 254, 284, etc.). These two adjectives, which Swedenborg employed synonymously (*C. L.* 475), are only applied to fermented wines. Generous, according to Worcester, means strong, stimulating, vigorous.

Our critic admits this so far as *D. P.* 284 is concerned; for he says "the word *generous* as here used, does not necessarily mean good, but it

undoubtedly means *vigorous* or strong in this instance. In this sense the term is used by medical writers at this day" (p. 151).

When the fine flavor of noble wine is referred to (*Coronis* 22), or vinous odor is mentioned (*A. C.* 1720), fermented wine is meant. For noble wine is never unfermented. And it is well known that the peculiar aroma of wines arises from ethers and volatile oils generated in their manufacture (see Pavy's *Food and Dietetics*).

Conversing with the spirits of the spiritual London, where, be it remembered, men were preparing for heaven, Swedenborg asked concerning wines, liquors, beers, cocoa, tea, etc. The reply was that there were such things there. "I asked," he continues, "likewise concerning the liquor called punch." The reply was that this liquor also is with them, but it is given "only to the sincere and industrious" (*S. D.*, vol. iv., p. 88).

But despite such incontestable testimony Dr. Ellis remarks: "If the lees, which fall to the bottom from the action of leaven on wine, instead of having a good signification have a bad signification, how can the wine from which such lees have been separated fail to have an evil signification?"

By parity of reasoning, if the evils, which are removed to the sides from the action of spiritual leaven, instead of having a good signification, have a bad signification, how can the resulting state of the man from which such evils have been separated, fail to have an evil signification?

The author seems to wholly misunderstand the use of ferments. We are taught that the Divine Providence of the LORD causes that evil, and falsity may serve for purification (*D. P.* 21). This is effected in various ways,—one of which is as follows:

Spiritual fermentations take place in many ways, for there are evils and at the same time falsities, which being let into societies, do the like as ferments put into meal and must, by means of which, heterogeneities are separated and homogeneities are conjoined, and it becomes pure and clear. (*D. P.* 25.)

As usual, the author is at variance with revealed facts. Here the homogeneity of wine is referred to. But the author nevertheless declares that fermented wine is not homogeneous. Now, what is the "like" in these two fermentations referred to above? Evidently the separation of heterogeneities; the removal of the foul and turbid mess of decomposed grape, and that of the evils and falsities which becloud the mind. But such removal supposes a cause, an active force. Hence the "like" extends to the purifying forces at work. In the one case, regeneration, this force is spiritual truth. In the other, it is a similar principle in the grape; for the grape is a corresponding form of good. In the one case, this preservative force, good by means of truth, rejects evils and falsities as heterogeneities,

and conjoins all that agree. In the other, alcohol, formed of a fiery principle, clothed with the finer elements of the grape, is the preservative force, which aids in the precipitation of decomposed nitrogenous matter, excess of bitartrates, fungi, etc., constituting the lees, and conjoins homogeneities into one invigorating, pure, wholesome wine. By its action on the acids, ethers and volatile oils are evolved, from which arises the vinous odor, now first produced. And finally, by commingling in the most intimate of unions with all the ingredients of the new wine, there is formed a smooth, rich, oily, and perfectly clear liquid,—"wine which maketh glad the heart of man."

The likeness, then, extends to properties of wine, chiefly to properties of the alcohol it contains. And hence, when by distillation the latter is obtained pure, it is very appropriately compared to wisdom (*C. L.* 145).

We have thus demonstrated that alcoholic beverages are normal stimuli, food, heat-producers, and agents in the digestion of aliments. This is deduced from the concurrent testimony of eminent scientists; and, above all, from the teachings of Swedenborg as a philosopher and as a theologian.

The quotations which the author of the book under consideration makes from scientific works are inappropriate, partisan, or utterly false. And hence his numerous reiterations that alcohol, wine, etc., are poisons, infernal putrefied substances, etc., may deceive the ignorant by the force of their repetition. But they are empty phrases to those who view the whole subject from the rational, and find confirmations in the plain, statements of the Word and the Word opened.

Swedenborg does not give us falsities and contradictions. If in one place he asserts that wine is fermented and has a good correspondence, and in another that it may be drunk, he does not assert in a third place that properly used it is a hellish substance. So, when we endeavor to comprehend the true meaning of Swedenborg's words to the Swedish Diet, we apply our knowledge of his views of alcohol, and conclude accordingly. If, as a physiologist, he considers spirits a menstruum of digestion, if as a theologian he speaks of liquor as an admitted beverage, commands the use of fermented wine in the Holy Supper, and declares that the regenerating man may drink wine to excite in himself charity, can he, as a correspondent, call whiskey *pernicious* because it is alcoholic?

The rational answer to the question of perniciousness is plainly given in the book under notice, in a quotation from Swedenborg: "The immoderate use of spirituous liquors will be the downfall of the Swedish people." The perniciousness lies in immoderateness.

We have demonstrated that the book in its linguistic and scientific aspects, is but a series of falsifications and perversions; we shall now see that this is equally true of the historic portions.

One of the most striking perversions is an attempted explanation of Egyptian wine-making. It is also illustrated with an engraving (pp. 78, 79). This figure, the author supposes, is an exhibition of "the straining of the saccharine from albuminous ingredients in grape juice." "The *immediate* drawing off and storing of the strained juice" is considered proved by the fact that both operations are shown on the same plate. Then it is presumed that "a coating of olive oil is poured on the top of the grape juice of the jars."

Wilkinson furnishes us with these pictures and also with their true explanation. He supplies other pictures, too, which flatly contradict the false explanations given in the book before us. He says: "After the fermentation was over, the juice was taken out in small vases with a long spout, and poured into earthenware jars, which corresponded to the cadi, or amphoræ, of the Romans" (*Wilkinson*, vol. ii., p. 157). We also read there "that the consumption of wine in Egypt was very great, is evident from the sculptures, and from the accounts of ancient authors, *some of whom have censured* the Egyptians for an immoderate love of excess; and so much did the quantity used exceed that made in the country, that in the time of Herodotus, twice every year a large importation was received from Phœnicia and Greece" (p. 168). Wilkinson does not in treating of Egyptian vineyards and wines make any mention of the preservation of unfermented grape-juice. On the other hand, he gives pictures of drunken Egyptians carried home from carousals (p. 168) and even of Egyptian women who had partaken to excess (p. 167). It is hardly necessary for him to add (p. 166) that "the Egyptian women were not restricted in their use of wine." Wilkinson adds, "In Greece women enjoyed the same privileges regarding wine as in Egypt" (p. 167), and that though in the early times of Rome wine was forbidden to females and even to men under thirty years of age, "it was afterwards allowed them on the plea of health, and no better method could have been devised for removing the restriction" (p. 166). "Athenæus concludes that they (the Egyptians) were a people systematically addicted to intemperance" (p. 169). We further learn that "in offerings to the Egyptian deities wine frequently occurs" (p. 164).

We can hardly believe that the author of the book is guilty of the systematic deception, which is apparent in this copying of a plate and in giving an explanation thereof the very opposite to that given by Wilkinson, from which it was taken. The author must have taken the picture and explanation from Dr. Samson, without consulting the original at all. But if so, how unreliable is his book.

Our space does not permit us to enter with equal fulness into the refutation of the many similar statements in the book, but we will at least make mention of the following.

In speaking of fermented grape-juice the author says: "It was regarded so polluted that even the ancient heathen would not dare to offer it to their gods" (p. 153). That this is false in reference to the Egyptians we have already proved; that it is false with respect to the Greeks is equally evident; for it is always in their offerings called οἶνος (*oinos*), and this, as we have seen, signifies the *fermented* juice of the grape. It is equally erroneous with respect to the Romans, for their libations were of *vinum*, which is also the fermented juice of the grape.

The author states (p. 67) that the Lesbian wine mentioned by Horace was perfectly harmless and unintoxicating. He evidently supposes it to have been unfermented. But in that he is altogether mistaken, for it is called by ancient authors οἶνος (*oinos*) or *vinum*, and this, we have repeatedly shown, is fermented. It was simply a light ladies' wine, which, like some of the Egyptian and some of the lighter modern wines, was exhilarating because fermented; but not intoxicating unless taken in very large quantities.

As to the use of wine in France the author in one passage declares: "As to the use of ordinary wine, it is almost entirely confined to the men. It is proverbial that if a young woman is known to be in the habit of using it, she is unlikely to receive proposals of marriage" (p. 72). The falsity of this statement is proved by the author himself in his slander on the French nation: "Drunkenness is the beginning and end of life in the great French industrial centres. At Lille 25 per cent. of the men and 12 per cent. of the women are confirmed drunkards" (p. 85). "Women rival the men in drunkenness. At Lille, at Rouen, there are some so saturated with it that their infants refuse to take the breast of a sober woman." "The French go about it as a business. I never saw so many women drunk" (p. 85). We see that abstinence writers are able to furnish testimony on the same subject of the most conflicting character whenever it suits their "good cause." The truth of course lies between these two exaggerations. The French as a nation use fermented wine, and generally in moderation. Drunkards in France, as elsewhere, are the exception. One of the queerest blunders of the author in connection with the above exaggerated statements of drunkenness in France is the following: "Look at the peasant at his meals in the vine-bearing districts! Instead of milk, he has a basin of pure and unadulterated blood of the grape. In this, its native original state, it is a plain, simple, and wholesome liquid, which at every repast becomes to the husbandman what milk is to the shepherd,—not a luxury, but a necessity; not an intoxicating but a nutritive beverage" (p. 71).

Every one at all acquainted with French customs knows that the beverage here described is a light claret, which, as is also well known, is fermented

grape-juice, pure and harmless—unless taken in an excessive quantity—and called "blood of the grape" from its redness. But the author, in his ignorance of foreign customs and in his exceeding fondness for syrup, supposes that the French husbandman quaffs daily for breakfast his pint of syrup!

Even Luther, who was a regular but moderate consumer of the fermented grape-juice, is somehow or other dragged in to support total abstinence. Probably the author is not aware of the *bon-mot* attributed to Luther:

> "He who loves not wife, wine, and song.
> Remains a fool his life long."

The author's ignorance of the process of making and of preserving wine, causes him to make several ludicrous mistakes. In every process of the regular manufacture of wine, he discovers some way of preserving *must.* Thus, it is well known that in Southern Europe part of the wine is sometimes boiled, and is then mixed with one-half or two-thirds of the same quantity of fermented wine to give it additional sweetness. Such wines are made in comparatively small quantities in Spain, Italy, the Canary Islands, and sometimes in Syria; these are the Malaga and similar sweet wines. These, as is well known, contain about twice as much alcohol as the ordinary wines (from 15 to 23 per cent.), yet the author mistakes them for syrup!

Then again, when the wine is fully fermented and is to be protected against acetic fermentation, it is poured into casks which have been fumigated with sulphur. This is described by the author in these words: "The last process in wine-making is sulphurization; its object is to secure the most long-continued preservation of all wines, even of the very commonest" (p. 78). The fact is stated with some approach to correctness, but yet the author's use of the fact is altogether false, for we read (p. 66) "they also used sulphur to neutralize the yeast or gluten" (p. 66). The real use is the expulsion of oxygen from the casks, so as to prevent the wine from passing from the vinous to the acetic fermentation.

The author probably reaches the climax of his falsification of history in the following:

"The time was in those lands (Palestine, etc.) when fermented wine was not called wine at all, but it existed under other names, and unfermented wine was the wine" (p. 69). This assertion is made without the least particle of foundation, and is one of the many fictions with which the author strives to support his position. The fact that from the first the term wine (יין) signified true,—*i.e.*, fermented wine, is evident that its earliest mention in the Bible is in the history of Noah, where it is referred to as an intoxicating beverage. The fact that this is not real but correspondential history does not in the least affect the argument; for we see from it that

the writer who penned this statement, and the people who read it in far-off antiquity (like Worcester and Webster of this day), knew of wine simply as the fermented juice of the grape, which when taken in excess produces intoxication. That wine (יין) preserved this signification throughout the whole of Bible history may be evident to any one from careful consideration. Intoxicating wine is evidently referred to in the story of Lot (1898 B.C.), also in the story of Hannah (1171 B.C.),—"Eli said unto her, how long wilt thou be drunken? Put away thy wine from thee." And Hannah answered, "I have neither drunk wine nor strong drink." This passage not only proves the quality of the wine used at that time, but also shows the falsity of the author's quotation: "It is beyond all reasonable doubt that orthodox Judaism has ever and always rejected alcoholic or fermented wine at sacred feasts" (p. 177). It shows how careless of the truth are the upholders of abstinence when they wish to prove their points. So again in the case of Nabal (1060 B.C.),—"Nabal's heart was merry within him for he was very drunken. But it came to pass in the morning, when the wine was gone from Nabal," etc. So we read of "Amnon's heart merry with wine" (1032 B.C.); and in *Isaiah* (758 B.C.),—"They have erred through wine and through strong drink are out of the way." In *Jeremiah* (599 B.C.) we read, "I am like a drunken man, and like a man whom wine has overcome." In *Zechariah* (518 B.C.), "They shall drink and make a noise as through wine." "And they of Ephraim shall be like a mighty man, and their heart shall rejoice as through wine." Certainly in these passages, taken from the various books of the Old Testament, wine is not our author's grape-jelly! Wine is there just what it is now defined to be,—"the fermented juice of the grape." Therefore the author's assertion to the contrary is wholly unsupported by the Word of GOD, and is utterly false.

As the author did not know that boiling the wine was only a part of the making of fermented wine, he was entirely unable to see how in Syria they could boil wine and still have fermented wine. He starts with an extravagant statement as to the prevalent custom of boiling wine in the following words: "The wines of Syria are most of them prepared by boiling, immediately after they are expressed from the grape, till they are considerably reduced in quantity, when they were put into jars or large bottles and preserved for use." "The Doctor (Bowring) adds, that the habit of boiling wine is almost universal [in Syria]" (p. 70). If this refers to wine-making, the very important fact is omitted that this boiled juice is added to fermented wine. It may, however, refer to the preparation of syrup or grape-jelly by the Mohammedans, who are not allowed either to make or to drink wine. But that boiled grape-jelly or syrup is not called wine, either in

Syria or elsewhere, is plainly apparent in the book itself, where we read: "Certain missionaries a few years ago declared that there were no unfermented wines used in Palestine at that day, and that by careful inquiry they could not hear of any such wines." But the author consoles himself by adding, "But it is evident, from the testimony we shall adduce from other missionaries and travellers, that if they had inquired for boiled grape-juice or dibs, and had been familiar with the writings of the ancients, who describe the method of boiling, and who called such boiled grape-juice wine (?), and spoke of it as the best wine (?), they would have made no such statements as they did; for they were undoubtedly honest, but lacking in a knowledge of the necessary facts, which would have enabled them to speak understandingly" (p. 69).

Who was lacking in knowledge, the missionaries or their self-satisfied critic, is probably by this time clear to the reader. No doubt had they asked for grape-syrup or jelly, jam or preserves, they might have received some; but the people knew better than to call such articles wine.

The author may indeed claim that he is no scholar, and that he had neither the time nor the ability to inquire into the truth or falsity of the statements advanced by the Old Church writers on abstinence. This we may grant, but it hardly excuses his indorsing these falsifications and perversions, and presenting them to the New Church with the air of one who has examined and knows whereof he speaks.

We have thus far seen that the author in his linguistic, scientific, and historical arguments has blindly followed the Old Church writers on the subject without taking the trouble of giving to their statements any critical investigation. The whole mass of the ferment of falses from self-derived intelligence in the Old Church has thus been emptied into the New Church. In his theological argument the author has applied the same course of falsification and perversion to the truths of the internal sense, as the Old Church had applied to the truths of the letter.

Some slight excuse may be found in the fact that before the writer had become acquainted with the New Church, and indeed before he had come to years of discretion (see p. 207), he had already espoused the cause of abstinence, and having imbibed with avidity the falsities of the Old Church writers, so as to make it difficult for him to receive the truth on this subject as presented by the New Church, he was unwilling to receive the new wine offered by the New Church on this subject, but holds to this day that the old is better.

As a sample of the falsification of the truth of the New Church, we need only take the two passages chosen by the author as a motto for his title-page. The first is "must signifies the same as wine, viz., truth derived

from the good of charity and love" (*A. E.* 695). The Latin of this is, "*Mustum sicut vinum significat verum ex bono charitatis et amoris*"—"Must like wine signifies truth from the good of charity and love." So the statement that must signifies *the same as* wine is not contained in this passage, the Latin for "the same as" would be *idem ac* (or *idem et, que, ut, quod*), *sicut* only signifies "just as," "like as." *Must* is like wine in this, that it signifies truth from the good of charity and love. But every student of the Writings knows that there is an endless variety of such truth, and that all the angels of heaven are in truth from good and in good from truth. *Must* in the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures is used in general for wine of the first year. Therefore the word has a similar signification in the Writings. We would expect therefore that *must*, in so far as it differs from the ripened wine, would have a more external sense. This we also find in the Writings,—"Must signifies natural truth. . . . Wine signifies spiritual truth" (*A. C.* 5380). "Must in the cluster signifies truth from good in the natural principle" (*A. C.* 5117). In so far as must is well fermented and approaches in nature to the ripe and generous wine, its signification becomes more interior. Hence, though must and wine both signify truth from good, must has a more exterior signification and wine a more interior.

In the other passage quoted on the title-page the perversion is even more apparent. We read, "False from evils may be compared to *such wine* and strong drink *as* induce drunkenness." The Latin is: "*Falsa ex malo comparari possunt vino aut siceræ, quæ inducunt ebrietatem*," which simply means "falses from evil may be compared to wine and strong drink that induce drunkenness." The words *such as* are not found in the original. The difference seems at first sight insignificant, and yet the whole doctrinal argument of the author may be said to be based on this mistranslation; and so falls to the ground when this foundation—*i. e.*, the mistranslation—is withdrawn. It is the only passage to which ignorance could cling to make it appear as if Swedenborg supposed there was a wine (fermented grape-juice) or strong drink (intoxicating drink) which would not induce drunkenness. We see this passage, therefore, introduced no less than eighteen times or about once in every thirteen pages.

We do not accuse the author of intentionally misquoting these passages, —perhaps he does not understand Latin. Nevertheless it is a peculiar example of how one error loves another; for here are two quotations selected as mottoes, and both of them palpable mistranslations, and used to sustain a point which a true rendering does not in the least support. Surely the doctrines of the church are in great danger of being perverted and misapplied when those without proper training and education undertake to instruct.

Another instance of false teaching is where the author exalts sugar above what is spirituous. We read of "sugar, so delightful to the unperverted taste" (p. 22); "the *delightful* sugar is perverted by leaven into alcohol" (p. 136); "alcohol developed by the destruction of a heaven-born substance, sugar" (p. 120); "the sugar which is so delightful, and which corresponds to spiritual delights" (p. 94). The author sees nothing but what is pure and heavenly in sweetness and in sugar.

It will probably be of some interest to mention the internal sense of *honey*, which in the Word stands as the representative of sweetness. "Honey signifies delight which comes from the good and true, or from their affection, and it especially signifies external delight, thus that of the exterior natural; because this delight is of such a nature, that it is from the world through sensual things, and thus contains within itself many things from the love of the world; therefore it was forbidden that honey should be used in meat-offering, concerning which it is thus written in *Leviticus:* "No meat-offering, which ye shall bring unto JEHOVAH, shall be made with leaven, for ye shall not burn any leaven, or *any honey*, in any offering made by fire unto JEHOVAH" (ii. 11), where honey denotes such external delight, which because it contains in it somewhat from the love of the world, was also like leaven, on which account it was prohibited" (*A. C.* 5620).

This passage teaches us several important points: First, that sugar (or its representative in the Bible, honey), which the author calls heaven-born "and so delightful," is really in the Word accounted so unclean that it was not allowed to "be offered upon any offering made by fire;" Secondly, it is said to be, like leaven, "rather hard for those who glorified it as heaven-born and as signifying spiritual delight;" and thirdly, external delight to which honey corresponds contains in it somewhat from the love of the world.

The author is equally at fault when, from his inner consciousness, he develops the signification of alcohol. We read, "Pure spirit we know, by its effects, corresponds to falses from evil" (p. 150). "We know both from its origin and effects, that it [alcohol] corresponds to infernal delights" (p. 161). Now when we turn to the Writings we find that the author is nowhere sustained in this assertion, but, on the contrary, he is in open and irreconcilable conflict with their teachings; for the only passage in which the signification of alcohol is referred to is in *Conjugial Love* where spiritual purification is compared with the rectification of natural spirits and wisdom purified with alcohol (*C. L.* 145). We are aware that the author disputes the correctness of this comparison, and also that comparisons in the Word and in the Writings are made in accordance with correspondence; but our readers will have little difficulty in choosing between the statements of the Writings and the assertions of our author.

Proceeding from the false assumptions furnished by his Old Church authorities, the author continually perverts and falsifies every passage from the Writings and the Word which he quotes. We will add a few more instances to those already mentioned.

"The wine declared by the Master of the feast (at Cana) to be 'good wine' was good wine . . . good because nourishing and unintoxicating" (p. 156).

That this statement is false may be seen from the term used, which is οἶνος (*oinos*) "the fermented juice of the grape" (see *Liddel and Scott's Greek Lexicon*). But there is another incontestable proof contained in the passage itself; the word μεθυσκω in Greek signifies "to make drunk, to intoxicate;" in the passive "to be drunk;" now this term is never used for designating the effects from any other than intoxicating drinks. Yet we read in this narration: "When men have well drunk (μεθυσθῶσι, literally, are 'exhilarated with wine') then that which is worse," etc. (*John* ii. 10). This also again proves the utter falsity of the author's statements where he says, "The Jews do not in their feasts for sacred purposes, including the marriage feast, ever use any kind of fermented drinks."

The example of the Nazarite is sometimes mentioned as an emblem of the Christian state, but when we know that the state in which he had to abstain from grapes and wine signified "a sensual and natural" state, but the grapes and wine (*vinum* = fermented grape-juice) signified the spiritual and celestial state with its good and truth" (*A. E.* 918), the New Churchman will hardly cling to that which represents the sensual and natural state, and which is recommended by the author, but rather press forward to that which represents the spiritual and celestial state with its good and truth. In strict agreement with this teaching of the above passage is the following from the *Adversaria:*

"Lastly it is added, that then the Nazarite shall drink the wine (*vinum*) which before was forbidden him, because afterward he is sanctified, for then wine (*vinum*) could not intoxicate him; as it is with the regenerate who are then not hurt by cupidities, because then the cupidities are no more excited by nature and by the body, but they are only the excitements of the natural and corporeal life. . . . Wine (*vinum*) is thus gladness or heavenly joy, for then it exhilarates, and only excites those things which are of charity" (*Adv.* vol. iv., 6879, 6880).

From this we see the use of wine in exciting the things which are of charity, and this explains why wine has always accompanied every state of high national development, and why its right preparation, preservation, and use form one of the criteria of the state of individuals and of nations.

Again the author falsifies Scripture when he states that "the people were taught not to look upon it,"—*i.e.*, fermented wine. This is a garbled quotation of *Ezekiel:* "Ezekiel reproduces the law, 'Neither shall any priest

drink wine' " (xliv. 21). The reader, not thoroughly acquainted with Scripture, would from this quotation suppose that the priest was not allowed to drink wine at any time. But the author had omitted the half of the verse which states, "when they enter into the inner court." That this partial quotation is intentional, and not accidental, appears from the fact that the offense is repeated in another form on page 215,—"Do not drink wine, nor drink that maketh drunken" (Lev. x. 8, 9). This is introduced as if it was a general prohibition, while the fact is suppressed that this was a command "to Aaron and his sons," and also that this command is further limited by the words, "when ye go into the tabernacle of the congregation." The same perversion is again found on page 227, where we read: "Let us all remember the words of Holy Writ,—'Woe to him that giveth his neighbor drink, and puttest thy bottle to him.' " From these words thus solemnly put, the uninformed reader would no doubt suppose that it was forbidden to give anyone anything to drink; but here as above the meaning of the passage is skilfully concealed by omitting the leading idea which immediately follows and qualifies all that precedes; namely, "and makest him drunken also, that thou mayest look on their nakedness." By omitting the qualifying phrase the whole intent of the prohibition is changed and perverted.

Another fancy of the author and his authorities is, that "the blood of the grape" signifies unfermented wine. He brings nothing from Scripture to justify such a supposition, but as he does in so many other instances, he assumes that which he thinks ought to be so. Unfermented must, however, is in the *True Christian Religion* compared to love of the world, and it is said of it that "it tastes sweet, but infests the stomach" (*T. C. R.* 404). Even must, when fermented, only corresponds to truth from good in the natural principle, but wine (*vinum*, fermented grape-juice) corresponds to spiritual truth. From this series it is evident that "the blood of grapes," which denotes the good of love, is not a step backward towards must, but is a peculiar kind of fermented grape-juice; probably, as Gesenius suggests, this name comes from the redness of certain wines. This is indeed plainly taught also in the Writings. "Wine (*vinum*, fermented grape-juice) is called the blood of grapes, because both signify the holy truth proceeding from the LORD, but wine is predicated of the spiritual church and blood of the celestial church" (*A. C.* 5117, see also *T. C. R.* 706, *A. E.* 918). Hence the author is entirely in darkness when he says: "Surely no one will pretend that the blood of the grape is fermented wine" (p. 115). As we see not only the dictionaries which are the exponents of the learning of the age, but also the Writings given by the LORD from heaven declare the truth of what he so rashly denies.

Quite as unfounded are the declarations of the author concerning "the

fruit of the vine." He proves, indeed, to his own satisfaction that wine is not the fruit of the vine, but then we have seen that in such matters he is easily satisfied. Perhaps in his ignorance of the language he supposed that the term here used for fruit is the word usually employed for fruit in Greek. But the term is not καρπός (*karpos*) but a more general term, γέννημα (*gennema*), which really signifies "that which is produced." And it is well known that wine and must are both the product of the vine, though neither could in strict literalness be called "a fruit." But even on this point we are not dependent alone on the explanation of the learned, for we read: "By the product (*genimen*) of the vine or the wine (*vinum*), which the LORD will drink new with them in the kingdom of His Father . . . is understood that from His Divine Human then will be all the Divine Truth in heaven and in the Church, wherefore he also calls it new" (*A. E.* 376). And again, "Because by wine (*vinum*, fermented grape-juice) is meant the Divine Truth nourishing spiritual life, therefore the LORD saith to them: 'I say unto you, that I will not drink of the produce (*genimen*) of the vine from henceforth,' etc." (*A. E.* 329). Here again the fruit or produce of the vine is shown to mean nothing else than wine,—*i.e.*, fermented grape-juice.

The author asserts on the authority of some abstinence writers that the Jews never used fermented grape-juice at their feasts. This we have already disproved from those passages which show that both at the time of Hannah and at the marriage at Cana the fermented grape-juice was used. Another plain Scripture passage on the subject is the command as to the observance of the feasts: "And thou shalt bestow that money for whatsoever thy soul lusteth after, for oxen, or for sheep, or for wine (יַיִן*,—fermented juice of the grape), or for strong drink (שֵׁכָר†,—intoxicating drink), or for whatsoever thy soul desireth: and thou shalt eat before the LORD thy God, and thou shalt rejoice, thou and thine household" (*Deut.* xiv. 26). So we see that the LORD has left no ambiguity as to how the holy feasts were to be observed. We also see that the drink-offering was always of יַיִן or fermented grape-juice, and this as well at the feast of first fruits (*Lev.* xxiii. 13) as at the daily sacrifice (*Exodus* xxix. 40). It is really surprising how, in the face of so many indisputable facts, the writers on abstinence, quoted by our author, could boldly make statements which plainly conflict with the declarations of the Word.

As the use of wine—*i.e.*, the fermented grape-juice—was enjoined at all sacred feasts and used by the Israelites: so also at the passover, as the author suggests, the LORD very probably used the passover wine, which was fermented. And this was the wine used by the apostles in celebrating the Holy Supper, as we see from the terms οἶνος and *vinum* employed by all the

* ya'yin † shechar

early writers on the subject. This is also plainly shown in the reproof in the *Epistle to the Corinthians:* "When ye come together therefore into one place, this is not to eat the LORD'S Supper. For in eating every one taketh before his own supper: and one is hungry and another is drunken." The ancient liturgies, in which the service of the Holy Supper is given, always denominate the wine partaken of *οἶνος* or *vinum*. In agreement with this ancient usage Swedenborg always uses the term *vinum* for the wine at the Holy Supper, and never the term *mustum*, much less *mustum infermentatum*. There can be, therefore, no doubt in the mind of scholars that the wine required for the Holy Supper is fermented grape-juice; and that this alone is the proper ultimate for the representation of the Divine Truth.

Concerning passover wine, which our author in no less than four places declares is unfermented, Rabbi Isaac M. Wise, an acknowledged Hebrew scholar, thus forcibly expresses himself:

"We do not know how often we have been asked and how often we have answered the question, what *yayin* means, whether it is fermented, alcoholic, and intoxicating wine, or a merely cleared and refined beverage, made of the juice of the grapes,—*Thirosh*.

"All ancient versions of Scriptures, from the Septuagint down to the last Targum, translate *yayin* by an equivalent which means fermented wine, and no ancient commentator or lexicographer deviated from this definition of the term. The most ancient Hebrew was undoubted *vun* or *vin*, which is identical with *vinum* and *oinos*. Besides, there are plenty of passages in Scriptures which prove that *yayin* means intoxicating wine. Noah and Lot were intoxicated with *yayin* (Genesis ix. 12). Aaron was prohibited to drink *yayin* or *shecher* before entering the sanctuary (Leviticus x. 9). That *shecher* means any intoxicating drink cannot be doubted, hence *yayin* must be intoxicating, or else it would not have been prohibited to Aaron in connection with *shecher* (Numbers xxviii. 7). The libation of wine upon the altar is commanded, and *yayin* is called plainly *shecher* שכר הסך נסך. That the libation was of wine and not of any other drink is plainly stated in Numbers xv. 5, 7. If *shecher* is a synonym of *yayin*, the latter must necessarily be intoxicating. If the libation upon the altar was upon intoxicating wine, the Hebrews certainly had no idea of any other kind of wine to be called *the good wine*, as the best was put upon the altar. It is with the wine as with slavery. The slaveholder's advocates attempting to prove from Scripture that slavery was a divine institution, and the temperance advocates mean to have the Bible say that *yayin* was not an intoxicating drink, although the various authors of the Bible books had no idea that it was any more of a sin to drink wine than it was to eat bread. They considered intoxication a medium leading to crime, but thought no worse of the drunkard than of the glutton, and in fact they belong to one and the same category of brutality. *Per se* the one is no more a vice than the other."—*American Israelite*, May, 1882.

In some cases the opinionated ignorance of friends does more harm to a cause than the attacks of the most malicious foes. The present seems to be such a case. For many an unlearned New Churchman, receiving the little book of our author and not possessing the knowledge necessary to refute its many falsifications and perversions, might take the wine of the Holy Supper in silent or open protest. And if the minister has not the learning sufficient to expose its character, a whole society of the Church might be misled and might substitute for the only true representative of the Divine Truth some article contrived by the self-intelligence of the vastate Church, and which might thus lead to the deprivation of that conjunction with heaven so necessary to the life and progress of the Church. In either case the table of the LORD is profaned, for we read: "Ye have profaned it in that ye say, The table of the LORD is polluted, and the fruit thereof, even its meat is contemptible. Ye said also, Behold, what a weariness, and ye have snuffed at it, saith the LORD of Hosts." And this terrible sin is involved in the insinuation that the weak may be tempted to their ruin by partaking of the representative of the Holy Blood of our LORD!

"It was," as we are taught in the Writings, "of the Divine Providence of the LORD that (with the Catholics) in the Holy Supper, the bread is given, which is the flesh, but not the wine (*vinum*) which is the blood; and yet it is the blood which vivifies the flesh, as the wine does the bread. . . . else they would have profaned holy things like the Jews" (*A. C.* 10,010). There seems at the present time to be an extension of this judgment also to the Protestant Church, in that it is beginning to substitute for wine unfermented grape-juice, whereby the representative character of the Holy Supper is changed and perverted. The whole opposition to wine as it is now developing in the vastate Church is but an ultimation of opposition and repugnance to the truths of the internal sense of the Word to which wine corresponds. In utter disregard of the import of language, and of the teachings of science, history, and theology, the author sees in this downward step of the dead Church an upward step; and so exhorts the New Church to follow the corruption of the Old! Surely such gross perversion is without a parallel. Never in the New Church has such a mass of false statements been crowded into the same narrow limits as we find in this book on the wine question.

3 2044 038 455 739

3 2044 038 455 739